

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application is requested.

Applicant elects, with traverse, the invention of group I, as represented by claims 1–9 and 17–19. The restriction requirement is traversed for the following reasons.

1. Claims 10 and 20, the independent method claims, are not restricted to screen printing. Thus, the "other and materially different" requirement is not met as alleged by the Examiner.

2. Claims 10 and 20 recite "curing the deposited layers." How does one "cure" a sputtered or CVD layer? The restriction requirement makes no sense technically. Thus, the "can be made" part of the restriction is not met. Patent specifications are addressed to those of ordinary skill in the art. Although patent examiners are not ones of ordinary skill in the art, "Office personnel must always remember to use the perspective of one of ordinary skill in the art. Claims and disclosures are not to be evaluated in a vacuum." MPEP §2106.

Claims 17 and 19 have been amended to provide antecedent for the molding recited in the last clause of each claim. In addition, antecedent has been clarified in the preamble of claim 19.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims define a single invention and are in condition for allowance. A Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul F. Wille

Reg. No. 25,274

Attorney for Applicants